UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/512,560	02/24/2000	Yudong Sun	ST9-99-153	6032

23373 7590 08/24/2005

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER	
BASEHOAR, ADAM L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2178	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/512,560	SUN, YUDONG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Adam L. Basehoar	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 June 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: The Amendment filed 06/07/05.

2. Claim 11 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C 101.

3. Claims 1-30 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over W3C's "Introduction to CSS2", http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-CSS2/intro.html#processing-model, 05/12/98 in view of Traughber (WO-98/14896 04/09/08).

4. Claims 1-30 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 11, and 21 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. All the elements of the apparatus claim could be implemented in software alone (Specification: page 10, lines 10-12). Thus the claim is non-statutory under 35 U.S.C 101 as not being tangibly embodied.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over W3C's "Introduction to CSS2", http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-CSS2/intro.html#processing-model, 05/12/98 in view of Traughber (WO-98/14896 04/09/08).

-In regard to independent claims 1, 11, and 21, W3C teaches a user agent computer processing method, system, and article of manufacture, wherein the method "parses the source document (HTML) and create a document tree", wherein the step of creating could generate a corresponding "DOM"; "retrieving all style sheets associated with the document that are specified for the target media type"; "Annotate every element of the document tree by assigning a single value to every property that is applicable to the target media type"; "From the annotated document tree, generating a *formatting structure*"; and "Transfer the formatting structure to the target medium (e.g., print the results, display them on the screen, render them as speech, etc.)" (Section: 2.3 The CSS2 processing model: Steps 1-6). W3C does not teach that customizing a requested document is done on the document server side. Traughber teaches that customizing the requested document was done on the server side (Page 2, lines 3-14)(Fig. 2: 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to have customized a requested HTML document for target device on the server side as shown in Traughber, because Traughber teaches it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention for servers to customize documents to be sent to user agent web browsers (Page 2, lines 3-14)(Abstract)(Fig. 2: 32), which would provide the well known benefit of reducing the processing load on the client side by processing the document on the server-side. In addition it was also notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention for servers to customize documents to be sent to clients for the purpose of

advertisements or display capablities by passing cookie data (user preferneces) from the client to the server so the server could better deliver user prefered customized data.

W3C also does not specifically teach flattening the DOM to generate the transformed document. As stated by the applicant, "flattening" a DOM strictly means converting it back into standard HTML format and that "flattening" was well known in the art and thus would have been obvious (page 16, lines 15-19). The process of which would have been equivalent displying the formatting structure on the target medium display (Section: 2.3 The CSS2 processing model: Step 6).

-In regard to dependent claims 2, 12, and 22, W3C further teaches wherein the style sheet is a cascading style sheet (CSS) (Section: 2.3 The CSS2 processing model).

-In regard to dependent claims 3, 13, and 23, W3C further teaches "identifying the target media type" and "Annotate every element of the document tree by assigning a single value to every property that is applicable to the target media type"(Section: 2.3 The CSS2 processing model; Steps 2-4).

-In regard to dependent claims 4, 14, and 24, Traughber further teach the "the web server recieves a request for an HTML page" (column 2, lines 3-4) from a client browser (Fig. 2: 30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for a server to receive a request for a document from a client, because Traughber teaches that it was notoriously well known in the art

that for a client to receive a document (HTML Page) from a server system, it must request it and the server must process that request.

-In regard to dependent claims 5, 15, and 25, Traughber further teach wherein the client contains a Web browser (Fig. 2: 30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, for the client (user agent) of W3C to have had a Web browser because Traughber teaches it was well notoriously well known in the art to use a Web browser to provide the benefit of access to documents on a server which is the embodiment of the invention.

-In regard to dependent claims 6, 16, and 26, W3C further teaches wherein the style sheet can contain "@media rule specifies the target media types (separated by commas) of a set of rules (delimited by curly braces). The @media construct allows style sheet rules for various media in the same style sheet." (Section: 7.2.1 The @media rule)

-In regard to dependent claims 7-8, 17-18, and 27-28, W3C further teaches wherein the style sheet is stored "either within the HTML document" (separate portion of document), "or via an external style sheet" (separate data file) (Section: 2.1 A brief CSS2 tutorial for HTML).

-In regard to dependent claims 9, 19, and 29, W3C further teaches "transfering the formatting structure to the target medium (e.g., print the results, display them on the screen, render them as speech, etc.)" (Section: 2.3 The CSS2 processing model).

-In regard to dependent claims 10, 20, and 30, W3C further teaches genereating nothing (removing) at least one object of the DOM in a response to a style sheet removal of an HTML element, wherein"if an element in the document tree has a value of 'none' for the 'display' property, that element will generate nothing in the formatting structure," (Section: 2.3 The CSS2 processing model; Step 5)

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 06/07/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regard substantially similar independent claims 1, 11, and 21, Applicant argues Intro to CSS2 and Traughber fail to teach or suggest the feature of applying "at least one rule of the style sheet to the DOM" performed within a document sever or system, where the style sheet rule was directed to a target device. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's remarks. As discussed in the rejection of the claims, Intro to CSS2 clearly teach each of the claimed limitations except the limitation requiring the requested document customization to be done on a document sever. Thus Intro to CSS2 alone lacks a proper motivation to customize documents on a document server instead of on the client system. The Traughber reference has been relied upon to teach that sever side document customization processing was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention. The Examiner agrees that Traughber teaches customizing a HTML web page by parsing a retrieved template and embedding data therein. And while Traughber does not specifically specify the use of style sheets, the Examiner notes that Traughber was not being relied upon for said feature. However, in response to applicant's

argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Traughber and what was notoriously well known in the art teach sever side document processing providing the benefit of decreased processing load on the client. The Examiner in the above rejection attempted to point out additional notoriously well known benefits of sever side processing based on a user target device to further clarify that sever side processing was a well known feature.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US-6,247,048	06-2001	Greer et al.
US-6,167,441	12-2000	Himmel, Maria
US-6,122,658	09-2000	Chaddha et al.
US-6,049,831	04-2000	Gardell et al.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L. Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER